5/12/70

Dear Harold,

Received your mailing of 5/10 today with all the interesting enclosures. Must reply in haste: Will just take the things in chronological order.

4/30 to Dick: If you have time, I'd like to know what you have in mind with Mayhew, the one who purchased the TSBD. I havet two clippings from papers here if you want copies...I miss the meaning in reference to my info on the neck fragments of their possibly being "further fragmentation of a fragment." With the rest of the bullet going or coming from where?

5/4 to Dick: Agreed on Nichols--there is really nothing more for me to say on him...6.5 fragment has much bearing on type of bullet which hit head from rear, as I'm sure you realize. Dick has taken me pretty much off the notion of a handgun in this case, but I expect to write him soon on the possibility of rifles which fire "lower" velocity unjacketed bullets...On the lung bruises, I welcome both Dick's and your encouragement to gather all that I can on this. Soon as I can, I'Ll compose a long letter to Wecht on this and will contact Fil. about it...

Enclosed (for both you and Dick) is what we got here on the Sprague thing. Good lord, where does he come up with such outright foolishness. I work with computors and know that what he claims to have done is impossible.

The CD 47 bit came to me through Fred Newcomb (see enclosed photostat of letter). I contacted Fred only to ask for copies of his PROBE article on LHO rifle pix. This letter plus the articles was his response. I'll write him today for copy of the article. (By the way, I have no correspondance with Fred in the form of discussing <u>any</u> matters; he has merely sent me some of his stuff. I don't want and will not seek to have a correspondance with him.)

LETTER TO MARSHALL: Very good! There isn't much else for me to say on that, and I'll keep it confidential.

5/5 to me: Good luck on Skolnick matter...re Neck fragments, I go with Dick in questioning what I got. Of course, the sketch was necessarily inaccurate, intended roughly to illustrate location and size. But look at it this wayX in terms of explaining such minute well-localized fragments. I think we can rule out the transverse process having played a role in their getting there if Morgan is right in saying it was undamaged--this damages too easily from force and pressure. If XX they are from a bullet which will leave fragments in soft tissue without striking bone, then they couldn't be so localized because the force necessary to dislodge them from the bullet (high striking velocity is important in bullet breakup) would have driven them further into the flesh. Something is fishy. My suggestion right now would be for either Dick or me (under a nom-de-plume) write Fisher and ask for the same information--or any other Panel doctor save Morgan (though past experience indicates the others would not respond to the inquirey). If Fisher confirms Morgan, then we are where we started; if he contradicts him, then need I say what significance it could hold?

Your 5/6 to all: Bravo!!! I cannot convey my joy at learning of the success of your suit and the particular response of hte gov't. Am glad that the Panel is next, for this concerns me directly and I'm anxious to help on it...Sorry, but not a thing in the papers up here.

5/8 to me: Your comments on "Dirty/Tricky Dickie" are well taken. Very close to my own sentiments. Next time I'm there, we'll have to discuss more politics than we did before for it interests me and, being surrounded by more "conservatives" than I can stomach, I tend to loose perspective of the "other side," with which (for the most part) I sympathize.

The Panel did see a side projection of the 6.5mm in the head. This enabled them to say it was embedded in the skull...as for your "notions"on the car washing, I speak with the knowledge that it was washed, based on what you sent me. As far as "notions" go are your ideas on what could have transpired while the washing was being done; at this stage, these are but "notions."

Will be developing matter of chest tubes/lung bruises with Fil. We know that Humes learned what Perry had done because Perry testified he told him. I go through all this in my memo on that.

As for the possibility of the 6.5 to have fallen out of body in handeling and been lost, forget it. It was embedded in the skull. Even so, it was visible on X-rays so I really can't find any inocence in the failure to mention it by Humes, had it been lost.

As for my "wish," this is one reason why I look forward so much to your up-coming suit. Anything I'd do on this I'd want to do with you. I feel that there is a perfect basis to get the pix and X-rays themselves. First of all, they are not private property, as I understand it. But what concerns me most is that two panels saw them and each gave 100% conflicting accounts. What better basis could there possibly be for the disclosure of that evidence?

Your suggestion about listing the contradictions is one I intend to follow. This will be the exact thrust of my Panel chapter, which is completely researched and will stem from a large revision of what I had earlier written. You see, the important thing to contrast with the Panel report is not the doc's testimony but their examinationof the pix. If in their report of that exam they say the pix confirm their testimony in a certain case, then the test. becomes significant. The fact is that the Panel barely confirms one thing about the entire autopsy--that there were two entrance wounds posteriorly. Everything--location, size, disposition and even the existance of other wounds--everything else is directly contradicted. More on this later.

Glad you are getting to do so much outside. When I'm next there, please let me help. Stay well.

Still,

Harold

cc Dick

P.S. - When you get a chance, please tell me how I can get a copy of Sylvia's "Accessories after the Fact" I would like one & none of the stores here have it.